

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665 issued to Teper et al. ("*Teper*") and U.S. Patent No. 7,480,723 issued to Grabelsky et al. ("*Grabelsky*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Teper* and *Grabelsky* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements specifically recited in Applicants' claims. For example, *Teper-Grabelsky* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 1:

receiving, from the user system, a user-specified search value of a search variable directed to a feature indicating a type of software application of at least one service of the services;

querying the directory of the plurality of services according to the search value.

Grabelsky merely discloses a search term that indicates additional information relating to a partial destination identifier:

In this method, the call-session request may also include a search term that indicates additional information relating to the partial destination identifier. If a search term is included, the method may include, using the search term, selecting a destination identifier from the possible matches of destination identifiers.

(*Grabelsky*, col. 1, line 65-col. 2, line 3.) *Grabelsky*, however, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "search value of a search variable directed to a feature indicating a type of software application of at least one service of the services," much less "querying the directory of the plurality of services according to the search value" of Claim 1. *Grabelsky* fails to remedy this deficiency.

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 7, 13, 19, and 20 and

their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,
Baker Botts L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460
(214) 953-6494

Date: April 8, 2009

Correspondence Address:
at Customer No.

35005